

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 and 5-20 remain pending in the application, as claim 4 was previously canceled without prejudice. In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 7-10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220988 to Hymel (Hymel). Claims 3, 5, 6 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hymel in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0132585 to Palermo, et al. (Palermo). Claims 16, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hymel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,600 to Nickum (Nickum). Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hymel in view of Nickum and further in view of Palermo.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that each of the peripheral devices operates with its own separate and independent relationship with the electronic host device once decoupled from the electronic host device. Independent claims 9, 10 and 16 recite similar subject matter.

Hymel describes an electronic device (110) that is in communication with an accessory device (120) in which the device (110) detects the accessory (120) and receives device information from the accessory (120) (see Abstract and FIGs. 1 and 2). Once it receives the device information, the device (110) can retrieve from the Internet a driver associated with the accessory (120) that allows the device (110) to control the accessory (120) (see Abstract). Applicants respectfully submit that Hymel never mentions anything about an accessory (120) having an operating relationship with the device (110) once the accessory (120) is decoupled from the device (110). In fact, referring to FIG. 2, if any of the accessories (120) shown in FIG. 2 are decoupled from

the electronic device (110), then the accessory (120) will not maintain a relationship with the device (110). For example, if the camera (216) or the monitor (224) is decoupled from the device (110), then these accessories will no longer have an operating relationship with the device (110). The claimed feature is in direct contrast to Hymel because the operating relationship between the host device and the peripheral device is at least maintained after the peripheral device is decoupled from the host device.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the above claims are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2008

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 E. Algonquin Road
IL01/3RD
Schaumburg, IL 60196

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Larry G. Brown/

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Tel: (954) 723-4295 direct line
Tel: (954) 723-6449 main line
Fax: (847) 576-3750